

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

June 24, 2010

The Board of Education and the Board of Career and Technical Education met at the James Monroe State Office Building, Jefferson Conference Room, 22nd Floor, Richmond, with the following members present:

Mrs. Eleanor B. Saslaw, President
Dr. Ella P. Ward, Vice President
Mrs. Betsy D. Beamer
Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr.
Mrs. Isis M. Castro

Mr. David M. Foster
Mr. David L. Johnson
Mr. K. Rob Krupicka
Dr. Virginia L. McLaughlin

Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent of
Public Instruction

Mrs. Saslaw called the meeting to order at 9 a.m.

MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mrs. Saslaw asked for a moment of silence, and Mr. Krupicka led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Castro made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 27, 2010, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Dr. McLaughlin and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed to all members of the Board of Education.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during public comment:

Dr. James Batterson
Patty Wilson
Dr. Victoria Oakley
Melvin Law

RECOGNITIONS

The Virginia Reading Association presented the *2010 Friends of Literacy Award* to Dr. Patricia Wright. Dr. Victoria Oakley, past president, presented the award, on behalf of the Virginia Reading Association, to Dr. Wright to acknowledge her support of literacy throughout the Commonwealth.

The Board recognized students in the Master's of Education Program at Virginia Commonwealth University. The students were accompanied by Dr. Cheri Magill, assistant professor at Virginia Commonwealth University. Dr. Magill said the students are studying school law and will receive their Master's Degree this summer. The students are from various countries and are teaching in the United States for three years in Virginia, North Carolina and South Carolina.

First Review of Proposed Amendments to the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (8 VAC 20-131-5 et seq.) to Conform to HB 111 and SB 352 Passed by the 2010 General Assembly

Mrs. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, presented this item. Mrs. Wescott said that the Board adopted revisions to the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* on February 19, 2009. The effective date would have been July 31, 2009 under the provisions of the Administrative Process Act. However, the legislation passed by the 2009 General Assembly delayed most of the provisions until the 2010-2011 academic year.

Mrs. Westcott's presentation included the following:

- The provision in the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* related to the Graduation and Completion Index to be used in the calculation of accreditation ratings is not delayed. The Graduation and Completion Index will be used in the calculation of accreditation ratings for schools with a twelfth-grade class for the 2011-2012 school year, based on data from the 2010-2011 school year. For these schools, the accreditation rating shall be determined based on achievement of required Standards of Learning pass rates and percentage points on the Graduation and Completion Index.
- School accreditation as it relates to the Graduation and Completion Index shall be determined by the school's current year index points or a trailing three-year average of index points that includes the current year and the two most recent years, whichever is higher. The Graduation and Completion Index shall include weighted points for diploma graduates (100 points), GED recipients (75 points), students not graduating but still in school (70 points), and students earning certificates of program completion (25 points). The Graduation and Completion Index shall account for all students in the graduating class's ninth-grade cohort, plus students transferring in, minus students transferring out and deceased students.
- The following sections of the regulations are delayed until the 2011-2012 academic year:

1. The requirements of the Standard Technical Diploma and the Advanced Technical Diploma ([8 VAC 20-131-50](#)), which were to begin with the 9th-grade class of 2010;
2. The increase in the number of standard units of credit for the Advanced Studies diploma ([8 VAC 20-131-50](#)), which was to begin with the 9th-grade class of 2010;
3. Changes to credit requirements related to courses for the Standard and Advanced Studies Diplomas (which are found in the footnotes to [8 VAC 20-131-50](#)). The credit requirements currently in effect for the 2009-2010 academic year will remain in effect for the 2010-2011 academic year.
4. The requirement that each secondary school offer a minimum of one course in economics and personal finance ([8 VAC-131-100](#));
5. The addition of one credit in economics and personal finance as a graduation requirement for the Standard, Standard Technical, Advanced Studies, and Advanced Technical Diplomas, ([8 VAC 20-131-50](#) and [8 VAC-131-100](#)), which was to begin with the 9th-grade class of 2010;
6. The requirement for all students, beginning in middle school, to have an Academic and Career Plan ([8 VAC 20-131-140](#)); and
7. The increase in the pass rate for full accreditation from pass rate to 75 percent in English and 70 percent in mathematics, science, and history and social science ([8 VAC 20-131-280](#) and [8 VAC 20-131-300](#)). (Currently the pass rate is 75 percent in English for grades three through five, and 70 percent for all other grades and courses. The pass rate is 50 percent for science and history and social science for grade three, and 70 percent for all other grades and courses.)

Mr. Krupicka made a motion to waive first review and approve the proposed amendments to the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, and authorize staff of the Department of Education to proceed with the remaining steps required by the Administrative Process Act. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

First Review of a Proposed Fast-Track Amendment for 8 VAC 20-630 Standards for State-Funded Remedial Programs

Dr. Kathleen Smith, director, Office of School Improvement, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement, presented this item. Dr. Smith said that the technical amendment to 8 VAC 20-630 will remove reporting requirements for school divisions as data needed for the Virginia Department of Education to analyze these programs is now available through the department's internal data information management system.

Specifically, the department can track and analyze data for students coded as remediation recovery. In the *Guidance Document Governing Certain Provisions of the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, remediation recovery is defined as a voluntary program that schools may implement to encourage successful remediation of students who do not pass certain Standards of Learning (SOL) tests in grades K-8 and high school reading and mathematics.

Schools are required to maintain evidence of a student's participation in a remediation recovery program along with the scores of any SOL tests taken following remediation in the

student's record. There is no need to burden school divisions with unnecessary reporting as required in 8 VAC 20-630 as a student's participation in a remediation recovery program is now documented within the student's test record. The amendment remove the burden of reporting requirements for state-funded remedial programs for school divisions.

Dr. Ward made a motion to waive first review and approve the proposed amendment to the *Standards for State-Funded Remedial Program*, and authorize staff of the Department of Education to proceed with the remaining steps by the Administrative Process Act. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foster and carried unanimously.

First Review of a Request for Approval of Waivers of 8 VAC 20-110-50 of the Regulations Governing Pupil Accounting Records and 8 VAC 20-131-240 of the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia from Richmond City Public Schools

Mrs. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, and Ms. Victoria Oakley, chief academic officer, Richmond City Public Schools, presented this item.

Mrs. Wescott said that Richmond City Public Schools (RPS) is requesting approval of a waiver of 8 VAC 20-110-50 of the *Regulations Governing Pupil Accounting Records* for Patrick Henry School of Science and Arts, a charter school serving grades K-5. Patrick Henry School of Science and Arts (PHSSA) is a public charter school operating under a contractual arrangement with Richmond City Public Schools. It plans to open this summer for the 2010-2011 school year.

The waiver request from Richmond City Public Schools says that PHSSA will frequently conduct walking trips and other excursions approved by parents of pupils, but that will not be approved through procedures adopted by the local school board. The request further states that PHSSA must develop procedures for planning and approving field trips in place of those already in place for RPS, to include a detailed itinerary, SOL alignment, list of potential hazards and procedures for handling emergency situations, which will be submitted to the local school board. The procedures will be reported to the Richmond School Board, but will not be approved by the Richmond School Board.

Mr. Johnson made a motion to accept for first review the request from Richmond Public Schools to waive 8 VAC 20-110-50 for Patrick Henry School of Science and Arts. The procedures for field trips and other activities and events would be approved by the parents, and would be reported to, but not approved by, the Richmond School Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously.

Final Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) to Accredite the Professional Education Program at Virginia Wesleyan College through the Board of Education Approved Process

Mrs. Patty Pitts, assistant superintendent, division of teacher education and licensure, presented this item. Attending from Virginia Wesleyan College were the following:

- Dr. William Greer, president
- Dr. Timothy O'Rourke, vice president for academic affairs
- Kenneth Perry, dean of the College
- Dr. Malcolm Lively, director of teacher education and associate professor of education
- Mrs. Stacey L. Wollerton, director of field experiences

Mrs. Pitts' report included the following:

- Virginia Wesleyan College requested accreditation through the Board of Education approved process. An on-site visit to review the program was conducted on April 26-29, 2009. The overall recommendation of the on-site review team was that the professional education program be "accredited with stipulations." Below are the recommendations for each of the four standards:

STANDARD	TEAM'S RECOMMENDATION
Standard 1: Program Design	Met
Standard 2: Candidate Performance on Competencies for Endorsement Areas	Met Minimally with Significant Weaknesses
Standard 3: Faculty in Professional Education Programs	Met Minimally with Significant Weaknesses
Standard 4: Governance and Capacity	Met

- The *Professional Education Program Review Team Report of Findings*, dated April 26-29, 2009, Virginia Wesleyan College's *Institutional Response to the Professional Education Program Review Team Report of Findings*, and a letter from Dr. Timothy G. O'Rourke, vice president for academic affairs and Kenneth R. Perry dean of the college, Virginia Wesleyan College, expressing the institution's commitment to meeting the standards were presented to Board of Education members at the March 18, 2010, meeting.
- On March 18, 2010, the Board of Education approved the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's recommendation to accept the recommendation of the on-site accreditation review team that the professional education program at Virginia Wesleyan College be "accredited with stipulations."
- Within a two-year period, the professional education program must fully meet standards set forth in the *Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia*.

- On April 2, 2010, Dr. Malcolm Lively, director of teacher education, submitted to the Department of Education the attached *Report on Actions Taken in Response to the Professional Education Program Review Team Report of Findings*, dated April 1, 2010, in which Virginia Wesleyan College requested that the Board of Education remove the “stipulations” and grant full accreditation.
- The report was forwarded to the on-site accreditation team for review and formulation of recommendations. The review team met via a conference call on Thursday, April 15, 2010, to discuss the request from Virginia Wesleyan College. During the conference call discussion, the team requested additional documentation from Virginia Wesleyan College. The attached memorandum dated April 16, 2010, from Dr. Timothy G. O’Rourke addressed the additional inquiries. Based on information received, the team unanimously agreed that the weaknesses identified during the April 26-29, 2009, on-site review had been addressed and corrected. The team recommended that the professional education program at Virginia Wesleyan College be “accredited,” indicating that the program has met the standards as set forth in 8VAC-20-542-60 of the *Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia*.
- The Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure unanimously recommended that the Board of Education accept the on-site accreditation review team’s recommendation that the professional education program at Virginia Wesleyan College be “accredited,” indicating that the program has met the standards as set forth in 8VAC-20-542-60 of the *Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia*.

Dr. Ward made a motion to approve the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure’s recommendation to accept the review team’s recommendation that the professional education program at Virginia Wesleyan College be “accredited,” indicating that the program has met the standards as set forth in 8VAC-20-542-60 of the *Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia*. In addition, the motion included that the following weakness be cited under Standard 2: The professional education program must fully and promptly implement its plan for systematically collecting, analyzing, and reporting longitudinal data on candidate performance. The motion was seconded by Dr. McLaughlin and carried unanimously.

First Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) to Approve a Braille Assessment for Teachers Seeking an Initial License with an Endorsement in Special Education-Visual Impairment

Mrs. Pitts also presented this item. Mrs. Pitts said that at the request of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure, a committee was convened on March 29, 2010, to recommend a Braille assessment to be considered as a requirement for individuals seeking an initial license with an endorsement in visual impairments.

After reviewing available assessments, the committee recommended the Braille Proficiency Test owned by the Texas Education Agency and administered by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The Braille-only test was developed by the Educational Testing Service

for Texas. The state of Mississippi also has adopted this test. States must seek permission from the Texas Education Agency to use the test.

The four-hour Braille Proficiency Test (0631) is administered as a low volume test by ETS, and is scheduled three times a year (November, March, and June). The projected number of new teachers in Virginia seeking the Special Education-Visual Impairment endorsement who would be required to take the Braille Proficiency Test is anticipated to be less than 30 teachers annually. State procurement testing requirements exempt competitive procurement up to \$50,000 over the life of the contract.

Mrs. Beamer made a motion to receive for first review the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) recommendation to approve the Braille Proficiency Test administered by the Educational Testing Service as the required assessment for teachers seeking an initial license with the Special Education-Visual Impairment endorsement in Virginia (pending approval from the Texas Education Agency to use the test) and authorize the Department of Education to begin the standard-setting process for the test. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Recommendations of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) to Approve Passing Scores for the Praxis II World Language Assessments in German, French, and Spanish and to Approve the Assessments and Passing Scores as Another Option to Meet Endorsement Requirements for Native Speakers or Candidates Who Have Learned the Foreign Language

Mrs. Pitts presented this item. Mrs. Pitts' report included the following:

- The responsibility for teacher licensure is set forth in section 22.1-298.1 of the *Code of Virginia*, which states that the Board of Education shall prescribe by regulation the requirements for licensure of teachers. The *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel (September 21, 2007)* 8VAC20-22-40 (A) state, in part, that "...all candidates who hold at least a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited college or university and who seek an initial Virginia teaching license must obtain passing scores on professional teacher's assessments prescribed by the Board of Education."
- The Board of Education prescribes the Praxis II (subject area content) examinations as the professional teacher's assessment requirements for initial licensure in Virginia. The Board originally approved cut scores on 16 subject content tests that became effective July 1, 1999. Subsequently, the Board adopted additional content knowledge tests as they were developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). Virginia teachers and teacher educators participated in validation and standard setting studies guided by ETS personnel to ensure an appropriate match between Praxis II tests and the competencies set forth in Virginia's regulations, as well as the K-12 *Standards of Learning*.
- ETS continues to update the Praxis II assessments through the test regeneration process. When this process results in substantial changes to an assessment, another standard setting study is required.

- The *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* (September 21, 2007) (8VAC20-22-360 B 2. b.) allow native speakers or candidates who have learned a foreign language without formal academic credit in a regionally accredited college or university to satisfy content requirements by passing a foreign language assessment in the appropriate language as prescribed by the Board of Education. In 2004 the Board of Education approved the use of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Oral Proficiency Interview and the Writing Proficiency Test as alternate tests to the Modern Language Association (MLA) Proficiency Test for Teachers and Advanced Students.
- Standard setting studies were conducted November 30 through December 3, 2009, for the Praxis World Language assessments in German, French, and Spanish which are required for individuals seeking the Foreign Language pre-K-12 endorsements in German, French, and Spanish in Virginia. ETS conducted the standard setting studies on behalf of the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) for the new Praxis World Language assessments. A detailed summary of the study, *Standard Setting Report – Praxis World Languages: German (0183); Praxis World Languages: French (0174); and Praxis World Languages: Spanish (0195) – December 2009*, is attached (Appendix A) and includes participants, methodology, and recommendations. The purposes of the studies were to (a) recommend cut (or passing) scores for the Praxis World Languages assessments and (b) confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level German, French, and Spanish teachers in Virginia.
- The first administration of the new Praxis World Languages assessments will occur in fall 2010. The current Praxis Content Knowledge assessments will be discontinued, with the last administration in June 2010 for German and July 2010 for French and Spanish.
- In addition to the state-specific study, ETS also conducted two multistate standard setting studies for each World Language Assessment in July and August of 2009, in Princeton, New Jersey. The results of these studies, including the passing scores recommended by the multistate panels, are attached (Appendix B) and include participants, methodology, and recommendations.
- The *Praxis World Languages Test at a Glance* documents (ETS, in press) for the German, French, and Spanish assessments describe the purpose and structure of the assessments. In brief, each assessment measures whether entry-level German, French, or Spanish teachers have the knowledge and/or skills believed necessary for competent professional practice. A National Advisory Committee of expert practitioners and preparation faculty defined the content of the assessments, and a national survey of the field confirmed the content.
- For each of the German, French, and Spanish assessments, the two-hour and 45 minute assessment is divided into four separately timed sections:

Section I: Listening with Cultural Knowledge (50 minutes) – 36 multiple-choice questions

Section II: Reading with Cultural Knowledge (50 minutes) – 39 multiple-choice questions.

Section III: Writing (50 minutes) – Three constructed-response questions

Section IV: Speaking (15 minutes) – Three constructed-response questions.

- Candidate scores on the four sections are combined and reported as an overall score; five category scores – Listening, Reading, Cultural Knowledge, Writing, and Speaking – also are reported. The maximum total number of raw score points that may be earned on each assessment is 98 for German, 97 for French, and 96 for Spanish. The reporting scales for the Praxis German, French, and Spanish assessments range from 100 to 200 scaled-score points.

- The panel recommended:

For Praxis World Languages: **German**, the recommended cut score is **61** (on the raw score metric), which represents 62 percent of the 98 available raw score points. The scaled score associated with a raw score of 61 on the Praxis German assessment is 159.

For Praxis World Languages: **French**, the average recommended cut score is **64** (on the raw score metric), which represents 66 percent of the 97 available score raw points. The scaled score associated with a raw score of 64 on the Praxis French assessment is 163.

For Praxis World Languages: **Spanish**, the recommended cut score is **66** (on the raw score metric), which represents 69 percent of the 96 available raw score points. The scaled score associated with a raw score of 66 on the Praxis Spanish assessment is 167.

- A similar process was used in the multistate standard setting studies. The panels recommended:

For Praxis World Languages: **German**, the average recommended cut score is **64** (on the raw score metric), which represents 65 percent of total available 98 raw points (the recommended cut scores for Panels 1 and 2 are 66 and 63, respectively). The scaled score associated with a raw score of 64 on the Praxis German assessment is 163.

For Praxis World Languages: **French**, the average recommended cut score is **63** (on the raw score metric), which represents 65 percent of total available 97 raw points (the recommended cut scores for Panels 1 and 2 are 59 and 66, respectively). The scaled score associated with a raw score of 63 on the Praxis French assessment is 162.

For Praxis World Languages: **Spanish**, the recommended cut score is **67** (on the raw score metric), which represents 70 percent of total available 96 raw points (the recommended cut scores for Panels 1 and 2 are 66 and 69, respectively). The scaled score associated with a raw score of 67 on the Praxis Spanish assessment is 168.

- When reviewing the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) for the cut scores recommended by the Virginia standard setting study as well as the multistate standard setting study, there is an overlap in the scaled scores. The SEM is a statistical phenomenon and is unrelated to the accuracy of scoring. All test results are subject to the standard error of measurement. If a test taker were to take the same test repeatedly, with no change in his level of knowledge and preparation, it is possible that some of the resulting scores would be slightly higher or slightly lower than the score that precisely reflects the test taker's actual level of knowledge and ability. The difference between a

test taker's actual score and his highest or lowest hypothetical score is known as the standard error of measurement. The Standard Error of Measurement for the recommended cut scores for the Virginia standard setting studies and the multistate studies for each language are shown on the following pages. In all charts, consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.

Standard Error of Measurement Summaries – German

Cut scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – German – Virginia

	Recommended Cut Score (SEM)	Scale Score Equivalent
	61 (4.71)	159
-2 SEMs	52	147
-1 SEM	57	153
+1 SEM	66	165
+2 SEMs	71	172

Cut scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – German – Multistate Panel 1

	Recommended Cut Score (SEM)	Scale Score Equivalent
	66 (4.50)	165
-2 SEMs	57	153
-1 SEM	62	160
+1 SEM	71	172
+2 SEMs	75	177

Cut scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – German – Multistate Panel 2

	Recommended Cut Score (SEM)	Scale Score Equivalent
	63 (4.66)	161
-2 SEMs	53	148
-1 SEM	58	155
+1 SEM	67	166
+2 SEMs	72	173

Cut scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – German – Combined Multistate Panels

	Recommended Cut Score (SEM)	Scale Score Equivalent
	64 (4.59)	163
-2 SEMs	55	151
-1 SEM	60	157
+1 SEM	69	169
+2 SEMs	74	175

Note: Consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.

Standard Error of Measurement Summaries – French

Cut scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – French – Virginia

	Recommended Cut Score (SEM)	Scale Score Equivalent
	64 (4.53)	163
-2 SEMs	55	152
-1 SEM	60	158
+1 SEM	69	170
+2 SEMs	74	176

Cut scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – French – Multistate Panel 1

	Recommended Cut Score (SEM)	Scale Score Equivalent
	59 (4.65)	157
-2 SEMs	50	145
-1 SEM	54	150
+1 SEM	64	163
+2 SEMs	68	169

Cut scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – French – Multistate Panel 2

	Recommended Cut Score (SEM)	Scale Score Equivalent
	66 (4.54)	166
-2 SEMs	57	154
-1 SEM	62	161
+1 SEM	71	172
+2 SEMs	75	178

Cut scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – French – Combined Multistate Panels

	Recommended Cut Score (SEM)	Scale Score Equivalent
	63 (4.61)	162
-2 SEMs	53	149
-1 SEM	58	156
+1 SEM	67	167
+2 SEMs	72	174

Note: Consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.

Standard Error of Measurement Summaries – Spanish

Cut scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – Spanish – Virginia

	Recommended Cut Score (SEM)	Scale Score Equivalent
	66 (4.47)	167
2 SEMs	58	156
-1 SEM	62	162
+1 SEM	71	173
+2 SEMs	75	179

Cut scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – Spanish – Multistate Panel 1

	Recommended Cut Score (SEM)	Scale Score Equivalent
	66 (4.44)	167
-2 SEMs	57	155
-1 SEM	62	162
+1 SEM	70	172
+2 SEMs	75	179

Cut scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – Spanish – Multistate Panel 2

	Recommended Cut Score (SEM)	Scale Score Equivalent
	69 (4.33)	171
-2 SEMs	60	159
-1 SEM	64	164
+1 SEM	73	176
+2 SEMs	77	181

Cut scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – Spanish – Combined Multistate Panels

	Recommended Cut Score (SEM)	Scale Score Equivalent
	67 (4.38)	168
-2 SEMs	58	156
-1 SEM	63	163
+1 SEM	72	175
+2 SEMs	76	180

Note: Consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.

- On March 15, 2010, the Advisory Board for Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) reviewed the studies and unanimously recommended that the Board of Education set the following passing scores for revised Praxis II World Language Assessments:

Praxis World Languages: German (0183) - 163
Praxis World Languages: French (0174) - 163
Praxis World Languages: Spanish (0195) - 168

- ABTEL recommended that the Board of Education approve the revised Praxis II assessments in World Languages: German, French, and Spanish as additional test options for native speakers or candidates who have learned a foreign language without formal academic credit to meet the endorsement requirements in these languages.
- The Virginia Department of Education and the institutions of higher education will have access to information about candidates' performance on each of the following categories of the tests: listening, reading, cultural knowledge, writing, and speaking. The information will be aggregated on the Annual Summary Report sent to the Virginia Department of Education and institutions of higher education.

Mrs. Castro made a motion to approve the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's recommendations on passing scores for the revised World Language German, French, and Spanish assessments, and approve the use of the revised Praxis II assessments in German, French, and Spanish as additional test options that can be utilized by native speakers or candidates who have learned a foreign language without formal academic credit to meet the endorsement requirements in these languages. In addition, the motion included the Superintendent of Public Instruction's recommendation that pass rates for the assessments be reviewed when sufficient test scores are received for Virginia test takers. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

Final Review of a Proposal to Allow Advanced Placement (AP) Calculus BC to Verify Two Mathematics Credits

Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, assistant superintendent for student assessment and school improvement, presented this item. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that the Virginia Department of Education staff has been contacted by a parent of a transfer student asking that the Board reconsider its policy of allowing AP calculus to verify only one credit in mathematics. The rationale for the change is that students who score well on the AP Calculus test have demonstrated proficiency in lower level mathematics classes as a prerequisite to Calculus.

Allowing an acceptable score on AP Calculus to verify two credits will benefit transfer students who often have taken Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II before entering the Virginia Public Schools but who may need as many as two verified credits to be eligible for an advanced studies diploma. Fairfax County Public Schools has also indicated support for the proposal to allow AP Calculus to verify two mathematics credits as long as this policy is restricted to AP Calculus BC.

Dr. Ward made a motion to approve the proposal to allow Advanced Placement (AP) Calculus BC to verify two mathematics credits. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.

**Final Review of Proposed Amendments to Virginia's Consolidated State Application
Accountability Plan under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

Dr. Deborah Jonas, executive director for research and strategic planning, presented this item. Dr. Jonas said that in October 2008, the United States Department of Education (USED) issued final regulations governing programs administered under Part A of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA). The new regulations require Virginia to submit to the Secretary of Education, for approval, revisions to its accountability workbook to comply with accountability requirements for the federally prescribed graduation rate. Requirements under the new regulations include reporting a four-year cohort graduation rate for all schools, school divisions, and the state for all student subgroups. The regulations also require that Virginia establish a statewide graduation goal that all high schools are expected to meet and establish targets for continuous and substantial improvement based on graduation rates.

Dr. Jonas' presentation included the following:

- In January 2010, the Virginia Board of Education submitted to USED proposed changes to its federal accountability workbook to meet the graduation rate requirements of the October 2008 regulations. Specifically, Virginia requested to report a four-, five-, and six-year federal graduation indicator calculated in a manner that is consistent with the federally prescribed methodology. The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) has received verbal feedback that the request would be approved if the calculation included only regular diplomas. Virginia further requested a waiver from certain provisions of the federal regulation and requested that Virginia be permitted to use its state regulatory calculation, the Graduation and Completion Index, for purposes of federal accountability. VDOE received recent verbal feedback that this request would not be approved.
- The federally prescribed calculation differs from the Virginia On-Time Graduation Rate adopted by the Board of Education in 2006, which is Virginia's official high school graduation rate. The results of the federally prescribed calculation will be referred to as the federal graduation indicator.
- Based on verbal feedback from USED that Virginia's previous request to apply the Graduation and Completion Index to Virginia's adequate yearly progress (AYP) calculations would not be approved, revisions are being proposed to elements in the

Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan to comply with federal regulations pertaining to graduation rates issued in October 2008.

- The regulations require that Virginia report a four-year federal graduation indicator and extended year indicators if they are used in making AYP determinations; establish a statewide goal that all high schools are expected to meet; and establish targets for continuous and substantial improvement in the federal graduation indicator. The proposed revisions will apply to schools and school divisions with graduating classes and the state's AYP determinations.
- Under the proposed amendments, Virginia would report four-, five-, and six-year federal graduation indicators as they become available. Upon Board of Education and U.S. Department of Education approval, there will be four ways that schools, school divisions, and the state can meet or exceed the other academic indicator (OAI) for graduation rates for purposes of making AYP determinations:
 - If the four-year federal graduation indicator is ≥ 80 percent; or
 - If the five-year federal graduation indicator is ≥ 80 percent; or
 - If the six-year federal graduation indicator is ≥ 80 percent (note that this indicator will not be available for calculations made in 2010; it will be available beginning in 2011); or
 - If there is at least a 10 percent reduction in the percent of students who did not graduate in four years compared to the prior year's four-year federal graduation indicator.

Mr. Krupicka made a motion to adopt the amendments to the Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan and authorize the Department to submit the request to USED for approval so that the methodology may be used to make AYP determinations in the summer of 2010. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

The amendments to Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan are as follows:

**Annual Measurable Objectives for Graduation Rate (Critical Element 3.2b) and Targets for Continuous and Substantial Improvement (§200.19 (b)(3)(i).)
Revised Proposal, June 24, 2010**

Request:

Virginia will report and use for federal reporting and accountability a federal graduation indicator using the prescribed calculation that does not permit cohorts to be adjusted to account for students' English language learner or disability status, and only includes Virginia's standard and advanced studies diplomas in the numerator. Consistent with the regulations, Virginia's federal graduation indicator is an adjusted cohort graduation rate based on cohorts of students who enter ninth grade for the first time; it is adjusted for students who transfer in, transfer out, or are deceased. Because the complete data on student graduation and completion, including summer graduates, are not available until after adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations are made each year, Virginia will calculate AYP based on the previous year's data. This will permit the calculations to be available in time to make AYP determinations before the beginning of the school year.

Virginia will report four-, five-, and six-year federal graduation indicators for the state, schools, and school divisions as they become available. Six-year adjusted graduation indicators will be available in the fall of 2010, and first applied to AYP determinations made in the summer of 2011. Virginia will report the federal graduation

indicator beginning with the ninth-grade cohort of 2004-2005; four-year graduates from this cohort would have earned diplomas by the end of the 2008 school year.

Virginia will use the federal graduation indicator for purposes of making AYP determinations beginning in the summer of 2010. Virginia requests that the following be approved for making AYP determinations:

- Statewide goal: 80 percent of students graduate with a regular diploma in four, or five, or six years.
- Targets for continuous and substantial improvement: 10 percent reduction in the percent of non-graduating students from the previous year applied only to the adjusted four-year federal graduation rate.

Virginia will average graduation data over three years to minimize annual variations in data impacting AYP determinations, as is permitted in Section 1111(b)(2)(J) of the ESEA. Averaging will be applied to the four-year, five-year, and six-year rates when more than one year of graduation data is available.

For purposes of calculating AYP for the Limited English Proficient (LEP) subgroup, Virginia will apply a definition of LEP students that is consistent with the longitudinal nature of the accountability measure. English language learners who meet the federal definition of LEP at any time since first entering the adjusted cohort will be included in the LEP student subgroup for purposes of accountability. This would include all students identified as LEP for calculating the pass rates for federal accountability *and* students who were identified as LEP at any time since first entering ninth grade or otherwise transferring into the adjusted cohort. Students who were identified as LEP in the early years of high school but are no longer part of the LEP subgroup when they graduate have benefitted from the instruction that our schools provide; our accountability system should reflect their commitment and successes.

Rationale:

VDOE has been notified that USED will not approve Virginia's request to waive certain provisions of CFR §200.19 as requested previously. Conversations with staff at USED and a review of approved goals and targets from other states indicates that the approach described herein complies with the federal regulations and accompanying nonregulatory guidance provided by USED. Virginia's overall approach is similar to Michigan's approved model. Michigan, like Virginia, included extended-year graduation rates and their targets for continuous and substantial improvement are similar to those proposed. Virginia's approach establishes a statewide graduation rate goal that is consistent with state accountability requirements. The targets for continuous and substantial improvement are challenging and recognize school and school division efforts to improve high school graduation rates.

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES

Mr. Krupicka made a motion to support and approve the Board of Education Statement on the Virginia Standards of Learning and the Common Core Standards Initiative. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously. The statement of support is as follows:

Board of Education Statement on the Virginia Standards of Learning and the Common Core State Standards Initiative

The Board of Education is committed to the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) program and opposed to word-for-word adoption of the newly developed Common Core State Standards as a prerequisite for participation in federal competitive grant and entitlement programs.

The Standards of Learning are clear, rigorous and have won the acceptance and trust of Virginia teachers. Whatever adjustments might be warranted to ensure alignment of the SOL with the Common Core State Standards can be made within the process through which the Board of Education exercises its constitutional authority to establish standards for the commonwealth's public schools.

The board believes this approach makes the most sense for Virginia for the following reasons:

- Virginia's system of accountability and support is founded on the Standards of Learning.

- The commonwealth is in the process of implementing recently revised Standards of Learning in English and mathematics that meet national benchmarks for college-and career-ready content.
- The revised English and mathematics SOL and the Common Core are comparable in content and rigor. The board's established process for revising and adopting standards is ideally suited to incorporating Common Core content into the SOL where warranted.
- The subtle differences between the SOL and the Common Core do not justify the disruption to instruction, accountability, professional development and teacher preparation that would follow word-for-word adoption.
- Adoption of the Common Core would leave teachers without curriculum frameworks, scope and sequence guides and other materials specifically aligned with the standards students are expected to meet. Experience shows that these supports are critical to successful standards-based reform.
- Virginia's accountability program is built on a validated assessment system aligned with the SOL; validated assessments aligned with the Common Core do not exist.
- Virginia's investment in the Standards of Learning since 1995 far exceeds the \$250 million Virginia potentially could have received by abandoning the SOL and competing in phase two of Race to the Top.

The Board of Education supported — and continues to support — the development of internationally benchmarked standards for states to adopt outright or to use as models to improve their own standards. The board, however, opposes the use of federal rule making and the peer review process as leverage to compel word-for-word adoption of the Common Core State Standards.

Dinner Session

The Board met for dinner at the Crowne Plaza Hotel with the following members present: Dr. Cannaday, Mrs. Castro, Mr. Foster, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Krupicka, Dr. McLaughlin, Mrs. Saslaw, and Dr. Ward. A brief discussion took place about general Board business. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 8:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Career and Technical Education, Mrs. Saslaw adjourned the meeting at 10:25 a.m.

President